UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,019	10/15/2003	John Barrus	20412-07973	9125

76137 7590 06/29/2009

RICOH/FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/29/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOC@FENWICK.COM
gsueoka@fenwick.com
nmorad@fenwick.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/687,019	BARRUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MATTHEW J. LUDWIG	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 March 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *3-9,11-13,16-21,24,26,28-35,37,39 and 41-68* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *3-9,11-13,16-21,24,26,28-35,37,39 and 41-68* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This document is a Non-Final Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communications: Request for Reconsideration received 3/16/09.

2. Claims 3-13, 16-21, 24, 26-35, 37, 39, 41-67 are currently pending in the case, with claims 1, 4, 18, 33, 41, 56, 57, 59, 62, 63, and 64 being the independent claims.

3. Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 22, 23, 25, 36, 38, 40, are cancelled.

4. Claims 3-9, 11-13, 16-21, 24, 26, 28-32 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moore pursuant to the arguments presented by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 3-9, 11-13, 16-21, 24, 26, and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moore et al., USPN 7,165,268 filed (10/17/00).**

In reference to independent claim 3 and 4, Moore teaches:

'***receiving, at a multi-function peripheral, a plurality of paper documents in an order; determining, by the multi-function peripheral, the order of the plurality of paper documents***'. See column 1, lines 38-54; column 2, lines 38-67; column 10, lines 10-35. The reference provides a sender of encrypted content messages. The content messages are fixed to paper and sent to a recipient. Based upon sequential content messages a multi-function peripheral determines an order and allows a recipient to validate content messages.

'***responsive to the order of the plurality of paper documents, selecting, by the multi-function peripheral, at least one action from a group of actions consisting of: creating a new collection, modifying a collection, and adding an electronic representation of a document to a collection; and performing, by the multi-function peripheral, the selected at least one action based on the order of the plurality of paper documents***'. See column 13, lines 1-67 and column 14, lines 1-67. The reference to Moore discloses a modification of a collection by selecting a reply to the sender and a validation of the content messages. Without any further language within the independent claim, the reference to Moore provides a proficient example of paper documents being received by a recipient using a multi-function device and based upon an order performing an action. Encrypted authentication message and encrypted content message may be fixed to paper medium using characters that may be scanned using an optical character reader or text scanning equipment. Among other alternatives, would be to use bar code printing to print the encrypted messages onto paper medium.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Moore teaches:

Utilizing a plurality of message blocks to add electronic representations to a collection of information based upon authorized recipients. See column 10, lines 9-35.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Moore teaches:

A proficient example of paper documents being received by a recipient using a multi-function device and based upon an order performing an action. Encrypted authentication message and encrypted content message may be fixed to paper medium using characters that may be scanned using an optical character reader or text scanning equipment. Among other alternatives, would be to use bar code printing to print the encrypted messages onto paper medium. Utilizing a plurality of message blocks to add electronic representations to a collection of information based upon authorized recipients. See column 10, lines 9-35.

In reference to dependent claim 7, Moore teaches:

Where there is a plurality of message blocks and the number of blocks is equal to three or greater, then the access by the authorized recipient to further encrypted content message blocks may be sequential or non-sequential, according to the determination of the sender. See column 10, lines 1-67.

In reference to dependent claim 8 and 9, Moore teaches:

Adding a supplemental block and then motivating the authorized recipient to continue to request the supplemental content message block decryption key but withholding from the authorized recipient the fact that the contents of the supplemental content message block may be of minimal value. See column 9, lines 42-67.

In reference to dependent claim 11, Moore teaches:

Other methods may be readily employed by the present invention in which the invention motivates the authorized recipient to continue to request further content decryption keys but where the primary object of the sender is to verify that the authorized recipient has actually read a content message block for which the authorized recipient previously was allowed to obtain a content message block decryption key. See column 9, lines 50-67 and column 10, lines 1-15.

In reference to dependent claim 12, Moore teaches:

Where there is a plurality of message blocks and the number of blocks is equal to three or greater, then the access by the authorized recipient to further encrypted content message blocks may be sequential or non-sequential, according to the determination of the sender. See column 10, lines 1-67.

In reference to dependent claim 13, Moore teaches:

The reference provides a sender of encrypted content messages. The content messages are fixed to paper and sent to a recipient. Based upon sequential content messages a multi-function peripheral determines an order and allows a recipient to validate content messages. See column 1, lines 38-54; column 2, lines 38-67; column 10, lines 10-35.

In reference to dependent claim 16, Moore teaches:

The content message may consist of a text message, or may consist of other types of messages such as graphical, photographic, audible or any other sort of message as may be sent in the prior art. See column 2, lines 47-67.

In reference to dependent claim 17, Moore teaches:

The content messages that provide a proficient suggestion of documents being transmitted and opened by authorized recipients. See column 1, lines 40-67 and column 8, lines 1-67.

In reference to dependent claims 18-29, the claims recite similar limitations to those found in rejected claims 3-9, 11-13, 16, and 17. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale. The claim recites a means for adding an electronic representation of the annotation to the electronically stored collection of information. The reference to Moore provides a means of scanning in content messages (annotations) and creating electronic representations of the content within the system.

In reference to claims 30 and 31, the claims recite the limitation 'removing preprinted marks from the image' and 'wherein the preprinted marks comprise lines'. It is unclear who or what is used to perform the above-mentioned tasks. As presently claimed, the recipient taught in the reference to Moore may physically remove any marks from an image on the paper document and therefore the removal of preprinted marks could be performed by a recipient, as presently claimed.

In reference to dependent claim 32, Moore teaches:

A recipient receiving further content messages based upon further replies. The recipient may go back and reread content messages and compare content messages as taught by the reference to Moore. See column 12, lines 1-19.

7. Claims 33-35, 37, 39, and 41-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dozier, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,870,552, issued

February 9, 1999) [hereinafter "Dozier"] as applied to claims 1-7, 11, 12, 16, and 17 above, in view of MacPhail, (U.S. Patent 5,280,609, issued January 18, 1994) [hereinafter "MacPhail"] and further in view of Bergen, (U.S. Patent 5,710,874, issued January 20, 2998) [hereinafter "Bergen"].

Regarding **independent claim 33, as amended**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

> *A method of providing differentiated access to a collection of information, the method comprising:*
>
> *generating a first pointer to a collection of information, the first pointer further specifying a first access level from a plurality of access levels;*
>
> *generating a second pointer to the collection, the second pointer specifying a second access level different from the first access level; and*
>
> *outputting a representation of at least one of the pointers.*

(It is noted that the application discloses a "pointer" as follows: "*Each collection has a specific, unique address or identifier, such as a uniform resource locator (URL), which provides a pointer to the collection. References herein to a pointer, collection identifier, or distributed resource identifier (DRI) can be considered to refer to a URL or any other mechanism, tag, handle, pointer, or technique for identifying a file, collection, directory, or other group of files.*" See, disclosure, paragraph [0053].

Dozier teaches a method of providing differentiated access to a collection of information, but does not expressly teach a pointer to a collection of information specifying a first access level from a plurality of access levels.

MacPhail teaches a pointer, or "LADN entry," to a security level associated with a document for the purpose of restricting access and users of the document. See, MacPhail, col. 4, lines 4-65, teaching the pointer and security levels.

Dozier and MacPhail are combinable because they both involve access to documents scanned or otherwise incorporated into an electronic form, with Dozier teaching multiple documents in files and security associated with access to those files, and with MacPhail teaching multiple page documents in files and a specific method of security involving a pointer.

The suggestion to combine the references may be found in Dozier, col. 15, lines 8-21, stating, in relevant part: "for example, a service might involve . . . specified access controls (such a security restrictions and access costs . . .." Dozier also teaches access based on the first page of a collection with links to other pages, in a similar manner to that taught by MacPhail. See, Dozier, col. 8, lines 52-66. MacPhail teaches security of access to the files in a more specific teaching.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of multiple document files with security with the teachings of MacPhail to use pointers to identify the security limitations because MacPhail teaches a specific means to implement document security on the same types of scanned electronic documents as those taught in Dozier.

The combination of Dozier and MacPhail teaches a method of providing differentiated access to a collection of information, and teaches a pointer to a collection of information specifying a first access level from a plurality of access levels, but does not expressly teach printing out a representation of the pointer.

Berger teaches a system for managing printing system memory that includes a security code printed out on a machine readable sheet, with such code limited to certain users with permission to access the printer. See, Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system.

Bergen is combinable with Dozier and MacPhail because they all involve access to documents scanned or otherwise incorporated into an electronic form, with Dozier teaching multiple documents in files and security associated with access to those files, with MacPhail teaching multiple page documents in files and a specific method of security involving a pointer, and with Bergen teaching a security system with a pointer to the documents that may be printed out.

The suggestion to combine the references may be found in Dozier, col. 15, lines 8-21, stating, in relevant part: "for example, a service might involve . . . specified access controls (such a security restrictions and access costs . . .." Dozier also teaches access based on the first page of a collection with links to other pages, in a similar manner to that taught by MacPhail. See, Dozier, col. 8, lines 52-66. MacPhail teaches security of access to the files in a more specific teaching. Bergen adds to the teaching of MacPhail by teaching to print out the security access printer for use by authorized individuals.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Dozier and MacPhail to use pointers to restrict security in accessing multiple document files with the teachings of Bergen that the security pointer is printed out as a means of accessing the documents because Dozier and MacPhail teach the internal security system while Bergen teaches a means of user interaction with that system.)

Regarding **dependent claim 34, as amended**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

> *The method of claim 33, wherein each pointer identifies a directory containing the collection, the directory further containing a file indicating an access level.*

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, MacPhail teaches that each document is assigned a unique name and a LADN. A LADN is defined in MacPhail as a pointer. See, MacPhail, col. 4, lines 4-42.)

Regarding **dependent claim 35, as amended**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

> *The method of claim 33, wherein each pointer specifies the access level by identifying a file indicating the access level.*

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, MacPhail, col. 4, lines 4-16, teaching access by security levels. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the print out of the security authorization with the appropriate designation of a security level.

The suggestion or motivation to indicate an access level is taught in MacPhail, col. 4, lines 4-16, teaching access by security levels, and is taught in Bergen, col. 11, lines 14-19, teaching that the print out of the pointer is for the purpose of limiting users to only those with authorization.)

Regarding **dependent claim 37**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 36, wherein outputting the document comprises printing a paper coversheet.

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system and the print out of the document sheet including the machine-readable indicium as a "machine readable code.")

Regarding **dependent claim 39**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 36, wherein the indicium comprises a machine-readable code.

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system and the print out of the document including the machine-readable indicium as a "machine readable code.")

Regarding **dependent claim 41, as amended**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

A method of providing differentiated access to a collection of information, the method comprising:

generating a first pointer to a collection of information, the first pointer further specifying a first access level from a plurality of access levels;

generating a first machine-readable indicium representing the first pointer;

generating a second pointer to the collection, the second pointer specifying a second access level different from the first access level;

generating a second machine-readable indicium representing the second pointer;

outputting a first document including the first machine-readable indicium; and

outputting a second document including the second machine-readable indicium.

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system and the print out of the document sheet including the machine-readable indicium as a "machine readable code." See also, Bergen Figure 11, teaching that the bar code representation of the address/target value is also printed with the security

code. Repeating the step of generating the access code at a different level is inherent in the ability to generate the access code at any level, and the mere repeating of the step at different levels is not patentably distinct from generating the access code at one level.

MacPhail expressly teaches that multiple pointers may be used. See, MacPhail, col. 4, lines 35-37 teaching that if a document is on one or more folders, then each folder has a pointer of LADN entry in the document relation object. Further, with the teaching of one pointer to one security access, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a second pointer to a second security access, for the obvious and beneficial purpose of allowing multiple security access to the documents.)

Regarding **dependent claim 42**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

> *The method of claim 41, wherein outputting the first document comprises printing a first paper coversheet and outputting the second document comprises printing a second paper coversheet.*

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system and the print out of the document sheet including the machine-readable indicium as a "machine readable code." See also, Bergen Figure 11, teaching that the bar code representation of the address/target value is also printed with the security code. Repeating the step of generating the access code at a different level is

inherent in the ability to generate the access code at any level, and the mere repeating of the step at different levels is not patentably distinct from generating the access code at one level.)

Regarding **dependent claim 43**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

> *The method of claim 42, wherein outputting the first document further comprises printing, on the first paper coversheet, a collection identifier that uniquely identifies the collection, and wherein outputting the second document further comprises printing, on the second paper coversheet, the same collection identifier.*

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system and the print out of the document sheet including the machine-readable indicium as a "machine readable code." See also, Bergen Figure 11, teaching that the bar code representation of the address/target value is also printed with the security code. Repeating the step of generating the access code at a different level is inherent in the ability to generate the access code at any level, and the mere repeating of the step at different levels is not patentably distinct from generating the access code at one level.)

Regarding **dependent claim 44**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 33, wherein the plurality of access levels comprises at least one access level selected from the group consisting of:

administrator;

edit;

delete;

read-only; and

add-only.

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, MacPhail, col. 4, lines 4-16, teaching access by security levels. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the print out of the security authorization with the appropriate designation of a security level.

The suggestion or motivation to indicate an access level is taught in MacPhail, col. 4, lines 4-16, teaching access by security levels, and is taught in Bergen, col. 11, lines 14-19, teaching that the print out of the pointer is for the purpose of limiting users to only those with authorization.

The Examiner takes official notice of the fact that at the time of the invention method steps that limit access to computer files by users or user groups commonly divide the groups into access rights defined as one or more of "administrator; edit; delete; read-only; and add-only," because that set or rights, including reasonable combinations of such rights, defines the set of common and well known actions which may be effected upon an electronic document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to define access rights as comprising one, more, or a combination

of the following: "administrator; edit; delete; read-only; and add-only," for purposes of fully describing the extent of routine electronic data manipulation.

Further, it is noted that levels of access to an electronic document which are described as: "administrator; edit; delete; read-only; and add-only," are implicit in a reference that describes limits to security access to an electronic document. "[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968). See also, MPEP 2144.01.

MacPhail expressly teaches that multiple pointers may be used. See, MacPhail, col. 4, lines 35-37 teaching that if a document is on one or more folders, then each folder has a pointer of LADN entry in the document relation object. Further, with the teaching of one pointer to one security access, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a second pointer to a second security access, for the obvious and beneficial purpose of allowing multiple security access to the documents.)

Regarding **dependent claim 45**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

> *The method of claim 33, wherein the plurality of access levels comprises at least one access level specifying that access permissions should be inherited from a containing collection.*

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, MacPhail, col. 4, lines 7-8, teaching that a security level may be associated with a document as it is filed.)

Regarding **dependent claim 46**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

> *The method of claim 33, wherein the plurality of access levels comprises at least one access level specifying that access permissions should be applied to documents within a containing collection.*

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, Chen, col. 4, lines 42-61, teaching "clipped" documents that are collections of documents with separate pointers that are treated as though associated with each other as in joined with a "paper-clip.")

Regarding **dependent claim 47**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

> *The method of claim 33, wherein the collection comprises a plurality of documents.*

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, Chen, col. 4, lines 42-61, teaching "clipped" documents that are collections of documents with separate pointers that are treated as though associated with each other as in joined with a "paper-clip.")

Regarding **dependent claim 48**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 33, wherein the collection comprises at least one multimedia item.

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, Chen, col. 4, lines 42-61, teaching "clipped" documents that are collections of documents with separate pointers that are treated as though associated with each other as in joined with a "paper-clip." See also, Chen, col. 4, lines 6-19, teaching the storage of a variety of file types, including multimedia items, e.g.: "JPEG.")

Regarding **dependent claim 49**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 33, wherein the collection comprises at least one item selected from the group consisting of:

documents;

images;

files;

video data; and

audio data.

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, Chen, col. 4, lines 42-61, teaching "clipped" documents that are collections of

documents with separate pointers that are treated as though associated with each other as in joined with a "paper-clip." See also, Chen, col. 4, lines 6-19, teaching the storage of a variety of file types, including multimedia items, e.g.: "JPEG" which is commonly uses to store an image.)

Regarding **dependent claim 50, as amended**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 33, further comprising:

receiving the representation of one of the first or second pointers;

reading the representation; and

providing access to the collection, according to the access level specified by the received pointer representation.

(Claim 50 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 35, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 51, as amended**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 33, further comprising:

receiving the representation of one of the first or second pointers;

reading the representation;

receiving a signal indicating a request for access to the collection; and

responsive to the requested access conforming with the access level specified by the received pointer representation, providing the requested access.

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, MacPhail, teaching retrieval of the document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 52, as amended**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 33, further comprising:

receiving the representation of one of the first or second pointers;

reading the representation;

receiving a signal indicating a request for access to the collection; and

responsive to the requested access not conforming with the access level specified by the received pointer representation, denying the request for access.

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, Bergen, col. 10, lines 21-29, teaching denial of a security request.)

Regarding **dependent claim 53**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 33, wherein the representation further indicates at least one criterion for changing the access level.

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, Bergen, col. 10, lines 21-29, teaching denial of a security request, and that such denial process includes a prompt for a valid security code.)

Regarding **dependent claim 54**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

> *The method of claim 53, wherein the criterion for changing the access level comprises an expiry criterion.*

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, Bergen, col. 10, lines 21-29, teaching denial of a security request, and that when the opportunities for entering the code have been exhausted, the program exits.)

Regarding **dependent claim 55**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

> *The method of claim 33, further comprising outputting a collection identifier that uniquely identifies the collection.*

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see, MacPhail, col. 4, lines 4-16, teaching that the documents are each assigned a unique identifier. See also, Bergen, Figure 11, teaching that the target document code is printed out, which in the combination of the inventions of MacPhail and Bergen, would be the unique identifier.)

Regarding **independent claim 56**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

A method of providing differentiated access to a collection of information, the method comprising:

receiving a first document comprising a first machine-readable indicium representing a first pointer to a collection of information, the first pointer specifying a first access level for accessing the collection;

generating a second pointer to the collection, the second pointer specifying a second access level different from the first access level;

generating a second machine-readable indicium representing the second pointer; and

outputting a second document including the second machine-readable indicium.

(Claim 56 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 41 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 57, as amended**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

A method of providing differentiated access to a collection of information, the method comprising:

receiving a selection of a first access level for a first recipient from a plurality of access levels;

receiving a selection of a second access level, different from the first access level, for a second recipient from a plurality of access levels;

generating a first machine-readable indicium pointing to a collection of information, the first indicium further indicating the first access level;

generating a second machine-readable indicium pointing to the same collection of information, the second indicium further indicating the second access level;

outputting a first document including the generated first machine-readable indicium; and

outputting a second document including the generated second machine-readable indicium.

(Claim 57 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 41 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 58**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 57, wherein each machine-readable indicium corresponds to a collection identifier.

(Claim 58 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 41 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 59, as amended**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

A method of providing differentiated access to a collection of information, the collection comprising a plurality of items, the method comprising:

receiving a selection of a first access level for a first subset of items in the collection;

receiving a selection of a second access level, different from the first access level, for a second subset of items in the collection;

generating a machine-readable indicium pointing to the collection, the indicium further indicating the first access level for the first subset of items and the second access level for the second subset of items; and

outputting a document including the generated machine-readable indicium.

(Claim 59 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 41 and, in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. It is noted that a collection is, by definition, comprised of a plurality of items. In addition, see Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system and the print out of the document sheet including the machine-readable indicium as a "machine readable code." See also, Bergen Figure 11, teaching that the bar code representation of the address/target value is also printed with the security code.)

Regarding **dependent claim 60**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 59, further comprising generating a collection overview representing the collection, wherein the first access level is associated with a first region within the collection overview, and wherein the second access level is associated with a second region within the collection overview.

(Claim 59 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 41 and, in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. It is noted that a collection is, by definition, comprised of a plurality of items. In addition, see Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system and the print out of the document sheet including the machine-readable indicium as a "machine readable code." See also, Bergen Figure 11, teaching that the bar code representation of the address/target value is also printed with the security code.)

Regarding **dependent claim 61**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The method of claim 60, wherein each of the regions within the collection overview contains at least one item.

(Claim 59 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 41 and, in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. It is noted that a collection is, by definition, comprised of a plurality of items. In addition, see Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system and the print out of the document sheet including the machine-readable

indicium as a "machine readable code." See also, Bergen Figure 11, teaching that the bar code representation of the address/target value is also printed with the security code. Note that Bergen, Figure 11, step 208, tests for the existence of a target document, without which no pointer is assigned to be printed out.)

Regarding **independent claim 62, as amended**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

A computer program product for providing differentiated access to a collection of information, the computer program product comprising:

a computer-readable medium; and

computer program code, encoded on the medium, for:

generating a first pointer to a collection of information, the first pointer further specifying a first access level from a plurality of access levels;

generating a second pointer to the collection, the second pointer specifying a second access level different from the first access level; and

outputting a representation of at least one of the pointers.

(Claim 62 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 33 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 63, as amended**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

A system for providing differentiated access to a collection of information, comprising:

a first pointer to a collection of information, the first pointer specifying a first access level from a plurality of access levels;

a second pointer to the collection, the second pointer specifying a second access level different from the first access level; and

an output device, for outputting a representation of at least one of the pointers.

(Claim 63 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 33 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 64**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

A file for specifying access levels, comprising:

at least two resource identifier paths; and

for each of the resource identifier paths, an indication of access rights;

wherein the access rights for a first resource identifier path differ from the access rights for a second resource identifier path pointing to the same resource.

(Claim 64 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 41 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

(The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system and the print out of the document sheet including the machine-readable indicium as a "machine readable code." See also, Bergen Figure 11, teaching that the bar code representation of the address/target value is also printed with the security code. Repeating the step of generating the access code at a different level is inherent in the ability to generate the access code at any level, and the mere repeating of the step at different levels is not patentably distinct from generating the access code at one level.

MacPhail expressly teaches that multiple pointers may be used. See, MacPhail, col. 4, lines 35-37 teaching that if a document is on one or more folders, then each folder has a pointer of LADN entry in the document relation object. Further, with the teaching of one pointer to one security access, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a second pointer to a second security access, for the obvious and beneficial purpose of allowing multiple security access to the documents.)

Regarding **dependent claim 65**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The file of claim 64, further comprising, for at least one of the resource identifier paths:

an indication of a geographic region within a collection representation; and

an indication of access rights for items within the geographic region.

(It is noted that the specification does not discuss the limitation of a "geographic region" and the term will be treated in this Office Action consistent with its ordinary and accepted definition to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention, which is an area of the earth.

The rejection of claim 41 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system and the print out of the document sheet including the machine-readable indicium as a "machine readable code." See also, Bergen Figure 11, teaching that the bar code representation of the address/target value is also printed with the security code. Repeating the step of generating the access code at a different level is inherent in the ability to generate the access code at any level, and the mere repeating of the step at different levels is not patentably distinct from generating the access code at one level.)

Regarding **dependent claim 66**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

The file of claim 64, wherein at least one of the resource identifier paths identifies a collection.

(The rejection of claim 41 is incorporated by this reference. In addition, see Bergen, col. 9, line 17 through col. 11, line 19, teaching the security system and the print out of the document sheet including the machine-readable indicium as a

"machine readable code." See also, Bergen Figure 11, teaching that the bar code representation of the address/target value is also printed with the security code. Repeating the step of generating the access code at a different level is inherent in the ability to generate the access code at any level, and the mere repeating of the step at different levels is not patentably distinct from generating the access code at one level.

It is noted that the path is the pointer or identifier taught in the prior art and it is inherent that indicating and accessing a collection of documents, as is taught, contains a path within the identifier or pointer identifying the collection by its file name or other file access code.)

Regarding **dependent claim 67**, Dozier in view of MacPhail and further in view of Bergen teaches:

> *The file of claim 64, further comprising, for at least one of the resource identifier paths, and indication that access rights should be inherited from a containing collection.*

(Claim 67 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 64 and, in further consideration of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. See also, Chen, col. 1, lines 44-61, teaching that security authorization may be set at the document containing collection level.)

5. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be

considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicants' arguments filed 3/16/2009 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on pages 19 and 20 of the amendment that Moore fails to teach or suggest an order of documents. As presently claimed, the order of paper documents and determining, by the multi-function "eripheral, the order of the plurality of paper documents, is being interpreted by the examiner as the sequential/non-sequential order of message blocks on the paper. The message blocks consisting of multiple pages would suggest an order of paper documents and the determination of a document order. Moore discloses that an encrypted message and encrypted content message may be fixed to paper medium using characters that may be scanned. See column 14, lines 47-58.

Applicant's arguments regarding claims 3-9, 11-13, 16-21, 24, 26, 28-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding independent claim 33 recites 'generating a first pointer to a collection of information, the first pointer further specifying a first access level from a plurality of access levels. (It is noted that the application discloses a "pointer" as follows: "*Each collection has a specific, unique address or identifier,*

such as a uniform resource locator (URL), which provides a pointer to the collection. References herein to a pointer, collection identifier, or distributed resource identifier (DRI) can be considered to refer to a URL or any other mechanism, tag, handle, pointer, or technique for identifying a file, collection, directory, or other group of files." See, disclosure, paragraph [0053].

Dozier teaches a method of providing differentiated access to a collection of information, but does not expressly teach a pointer to a collection of information specifying a first access level from a plurality of access levels. MacPhail teaches a pointer, or "LADN entry," to a security level associated with a document for the purpose of restricting access and users of the document. See, MacPhail, col. 4, lines 4-65, teaching the pointer and security levels.

Dozier and MacPhail are a proficient combination because they both involve access to documents scanned or otherwise incorporated into an electronic form, with Dozier teaching multiple documents in files and security associated with access to those files, and with MacPhail teaching multiple page documents in files and a specific method of security involving a pointer. The newly added claim language within independent claim 33 provides access priveledges for a first level and second level regarding a collection of information. Dozier provides administrative tasks, such as setting access controls (i.e. costs and security privileges), for collections. The reference provides the basis or suggestion of priority access. The examiner disagrees with the applicant and points to the MacPhail reference, column 4, lines 4-65, which provides 'LADN entry' to a security level associated with a document for the purpose of restricting

access and users of the document. The reference suggests access privileges and would have limited access to document collections through the use of access restrictions.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ML
/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178